

- To lead a multi-jurisdictional, multi-stakeholder process for identifying, assessing, prioritizing, selecting, and implementing specific actions to conserve chinook salmon.

Each WRIA plan will be based on analyses of factors limiting salmon survival in the WRIA, based on available science. The analyses will be conducted by a combination of King County staff, consulting support, and the technical committees and working groups established in each WRIA.

Each plan will:

- Specify actions necessary to aid the recovery of the species. These actions will generally be prioritized based on the relative importance of the limiting factors they address, their likelihood of success, and their cost-effectiveness.
- Identify key remaining uncertainties and information gaps, and research programs to address them.
- Contain an extensive monitoring program to allow for effective adaptive management.

In each King County-led WRIAs in the Cedar-Sammamish and Green/Duwamish Watersheds, a steering committee has been convened to guide the ESA response that represents a broad array of local governments, tribes, state and federal agencies, as well as representatives of business, environmental agencies, agriculture and timber interests. The planning efforts will be supported extensively by technical expertise and scientific research to fill the gaps in knowledge. An extensive public outreach and involvement program is included to increase public awareness and understanding through individual, community, and institutional involvement and action in support of salmon recovery.

Each of the King County steering committees has adopted an outline, following NMFS' guidance that includes timelines and milestones for specific actions.

Early Actions in WRIAs

King County and other jurisdictions and organizations within the Tri-County area are taking early actions toward salmon recovery and conservation. Following is a description of "early actions" proposed by the Steering Committees of WRIAs 8 and 9.

Cedar-Sammamish WRIA 8 Early Actions:

- *Education/Public Involvement.* This involves both inclusion of public involvement strategies while developing the plan and including basin residents in decision-making.
- *Basin Plan Implementation*
- *Acquisition Funding*
- *Floodplain Buyouts*
- *Passage improvements for juvenile salmonids at Ballard Locks*

- *Major restoration on lower Bear Creek*
- *Restoration on the Sammamish River and other habitats*
- *Research: Important research has begun through studies supporting a Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) being developed by the King County Wastewater Treatment Division.*
- *Ecosystem Restoration Studies*
- *Lake Washington Ecological Studies*

Green/Duwamish WRIA 9 Early Actions:

- *Programmatic Review:* Individual jurisdictions within the watershed plan will review and evaluate their programs, similar to the process conducted by King County (see Chapter 6).
- *Education/Public Involvement*
- *Watershed Forum and Ecosystem Restoration Study Processes*
- *Conservation Actions*
- *Remediation Actions*
- *Research:* King County is conducting the Green/Duwamish Watershed Water Quality Assessment to develop a water quality model of the Green/Duwamish River, its tributaries, and Elliott Bay. There also are a number of immediate GIS updates that are about to take place, incorporating aerial photography, that will provide information needed to develop and complete the WRIA 9 conservation plan.

Chapter 8: Funding and Implementation

King County has made substantial funding commitments to salmon in the past and has allocated considerable funds in its current budget. King County is committed to an aggressive strategy to fund future projects and programs related to salmon recovery. This chapter describes past, current, and future funding efforts.

Past Commitments

Over the past decade, King County has spent more than \$195 million for salmon-related projects and programs. This includes:

Planning: More than \$11 million to fund a variety of plans focused on salmon habitat needs and priorities, including basin plans for five major stream and river basins, habitat inventories, and detailed studies.

Land acquisitions. More than \$160 million for acquisition of riparian and upland habitat that directly benefits salmon.



Habitat restoration. More than \$19 million to restore habitat along salmon-bearing streams and rivers.

Public outreach. More than \$2.8 million on salmon-related public outreach activities, including public education, volunteer events, stewardship and communications.

Intergovernmental coordination. More than \$4.9 million in the last five years to establish and support the Watershed Forums and WRIA Steering Committees to convene local governments and other interests to address salmon issues.

Current Budget

King County has allocated more than \$15.4 million in funding in the 1998 and 1999 budgets to initiate watershed conservation planning, to implement the first round of land acquisition and habitat improvements, and to build a funding strategy to meet long-term needs.

Future Funding

In anticipation of major ongoing costs associated with the ESA response, King County has devised an aggressive fundraising strategy that includes the following initiatives:

- Pursuing the creation of a new countywide funding source through the Regional Needs Assessment.
- Building interlocal funding partnerships via the Watershed Forums and other watershed alliances.
- Applying for state funds through existing grant programs.
- Working with political leaders to create a sustained, dedicated, state funding source for salmon recovery.
- Supporting an earmarked federal appropriation to coastal salmon recovery in FY 2000 and beyond.
- Diversifying the federal strategy by opening Corps of Engineers and EPA conduits for funding.
- Building partnerships with private entities through corporate co-sponsorship of salmon projects.
- Exploring the creation of habitat banks with regulators and the regulated communities.



Chapter 9: Seattle, Bellevue and other Cities of King County

The Tri-County effort encompasses all the municipal jurisdictions of King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties. In King County that includes 39 cities, many of which are participating in the WRIA process. In preparing a response to the listing of Puget Sound Chinook under the ESA, each jurisdiction was invited to submit a description of current or early actions it believed would conserve the species.

The documents provided by each city as well as the Port of Seattle are included in the King County response as they were prepared by that jurisdiction. The commitments and early action commitments of these cities should be considered as integral pieces of the overall conservation strategy, and the contribution they make to recovery of chinook salmon should be evaluated in the context of the entire Tri-County response.

This chapter includes submittals from: Seattle, Bellevue, Kent, Shoreline, Renton, Kirkland, Auburn, Burien, SeaTac, Tukwila, Normandy Park, Duvall, North Bend, Snoqualmie, and the Port of Seattle.

Acknowledgments

KING COUNTY EXECUTIVE

The Honorable Ron Sims

METROPOLITAN KING COUNTY COUNCIL ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT COMMITTEE

Louise Miller, Chair, Metropolitan King County Council

Larry Phillips, Metropolitan King County Councilmember

Dwight Pelz, Metropolitan King County Councilmember

Pete VonReichbauer, Metropolitan King County Councilmember

EXECUTIVE GROWTH MANAGEMENT SUBCABINET

Pam Bissonnette, Director, Department of Natural Resources

Greg Kipp, Director, Department of Development & Environmental Services

Barbara J. Gletne, Director, Department of Community & Human Services

Craig Larsen, Director, Department of Parks & Recreation

Pat Steel, Director, Budget Office

Paul Tolliver, Director, Department of Transportation

ESA POLICY COORDINATION OFFICE

Tim Ceis, Director
Jackie Kirn, Senior Policy Manager

Dennis Canty, GI James, Bruce Laing, Ikuno Masterson, Curtis Terry, Mike Wilkins

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Kurt Triplett, Deputy Director
Nancy Davidson, Regional Water Resources Manager
Bob Burns, Lindsay Halm, Mark Isaacson

Water and Land Resources Division

Nancy Hansen, Manager
Steve Nicholas, Manager, Watershed Coordination Section

Debbie Arima, Anne Bikle, Curt Crawford, Luanne Coachman, Megann Devine, Bill Eckel, Bob Fuerstenberg, Wendy Gable, Linda Hanson, Ray Heller, Louise Kulzer, John Lombard, Gino Lucchetti, David Masters, Tina Miller, Doug Osterman, Laurel Preston, Joanna Richey, David St. John, Megan Smith, John Strand, Jeanne Stypula, Kelly Whiting, Ruoxi Zhang

Wastewater Treatment Division

Don Theiler, Manager

Greg Bush, Diane Concannon, Steve Gilbert, Karen Huber, Shirley Marroquin, Wes Sprague

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Road Services Division

Harold Tanaguchi, Manager, Road Services Division

Tom Bertek, Kathy Brown, Jerry Creek, Peggy Dorothy, Chad Durand, Howard Haemmerle, Lydia Reynolds, Vicki Shapley

DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

Jim Ballweber, Mason Bowles, Claire Dyckman, Don Finney, James Hatch, Rich Hudson, Barbara Heavey, Susie Kalhorn, Mark Mitchell, Jeff O'Neill, Harry Reinert, Randy Sandin, Jeff Stern, Christina Tiffany

SPECIAL THANKS TO: John Briggs, Maggie Brown, Joanna Grist, Chuck Lennox, Andrew Marcuse, Mark Matassa, Marie McCaffrey, Leslie McLean, Andy Ryan, Mike Sinsky, Sally Thomas, Marla Williams, Karen Wolf, Quentin Yerxa, Connie Zimmerman.